

first 2 years as Governor, he established a long-distance learning program and a telemedicine network in Georgia. He cut taxes for working families and oversaw the passage of tougher penalties for violent and repeat criminals. Through it all, he remained Georgia's most popular Governor since political polling began. When he left the Governor's office in 1999, polls showed him with an approval rating of about 85 percent.

One reason he was such a successful Governor is that, like PAUL COVERDELL, ZELL MILLER builds bridges, not walls; like Senator COVERDELL, he is committed to bipartisan progress. They are not from the same party, but in some fundamental ways they are cut from the same cloth.

ZELL MILLER's success is that he has always taken the long view. As he once told a reporter:

I'm enough of a history professor to know that your real judge is not your contemporaries, but history.

In deciding public policy, he has said, the most important question is not, How will this affect my chances in the next election? The proper question is, What will this mean for my grandchildren?

Mr. President, I can't think of a better standard by which to judge our decisions in this body, nor can I think of a better person to fill the seat vacated by our friend PAUL COVERDELL.

Senator MILLER, welcome to the Senate. We are honored to have you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Georgia.

#### SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF GEORGIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, to the distinguished Members of the Senate, first let me say how much I appreciate those very generous welcoming remarks.

I do not rise this morning to tell you more about myself or to introduce myself to you because there will be time enough for that later. I rise instead to add my voice to the remarkable chorus that has echoed forth from this floor to the marble floors under Georgia's Capitol dome, a chorus of praise for PAUL COVERDELL. The pain and the love that the majority leader showed as he made that terrible announcement on the Senate floor touched many hearts in Georgia. The eloquence of Senator MOYNIHAN's tribute still rings in our ears. And the personal tribute from Senator GRAMM, a native son of Georgia, I found especially moving. When he spoke of PAUL as a man with a thin body, a squeaky voice, but the heart of a lion, heads were nodding and eyes were misting up from the Potomac River to the Chattahoochee River.

Then this morning, I sat in the gallery and listened to the outpouring of love and praise you had for Senator COVERDELL.

On behalf of the people of Georgia, I thank you. I thank you for your words

and your tears and your testimony to one of Georgia's finest sons.

You who served with PAUL knew him well. I served with PAUL and knew him well also. I served with him when he was an up-and-coming State Senator and I was the Senate President—PAUL, a Republican; I, a Democrat. Yet PAUL impressed me with his ability and his integrity and his bipartisan commitment to serving the people first and politics second that I named him as one of the first Republican committee chairmen since Reconstruction in our heavily Democratic State senate.

In that job and in that State senate, PAUL flourished. He reached across party lines to build coalitions to reform education, improve our schools, and open up our government to the people.

Later, as the Director of the Peace Corps, PAUL's dignity and decency inspired countless young people to serve their fellow man; and then his service in this Senate, where in less than 8 years he rose to be one of the most influential, respected, and beloved Members of this august body.

Now, when I think of PAUL COVERDELL, I am reminded of St. Paul's letter to Timothy. It is as if it were written by Senator PAUL rather than St. Paul: I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith.

Today it is up to us to take up that fight, to continue that course, to keep that faith.

You are, of course, aware of PAUL's tireless work here in this body on behalf of the schoolchildren of this country. Yet his work here was just an extension of his lifelong commitment to education. We served together as trustees on the board of that tiny college, Young Harris College, in the tiny village that is my hometown.

PAUL COVERDELL had faith in education, and I intend to keep that faith. In Georgia, PAUL was a leader early on of a reform movement that believed that sunlight was the best disinfectant. So working together across party lines, we opened up the Senate Chambers and the smoke-filled rooms and gave government back to our people. PAUL COVERDELL had a faith in open, honest government, and I will keep that faith.

In the Peace Corps and in the Senate, PAUL was convinced that as the beacon of freedom for all the world, America could not hide her light under a bushel. And so he worked to keep America strong, to keep America engaged in the world, to ensure that she is always an ally to be trusted and an adversary to be feared. PAUL COVERDELL had limitless faith in America, and I intend to keep that faith.

In addition to what he accomplished, PAUL will always be remembered for how he accomplished it. He was as committed a Republican as I am a dedicated Democrat. Yet he was always looking for ways to get things done across party lines. He did so not by abandoning his principles but by heeding and listening to the proverb:

A soft answer turneth away wrath: but grievous words stir up anger.

I am a different man from PAUL COVERDELL. I have rarely been accused of giving soft answers and, in my day, I suppose I have uttered more of my share of grievous words that have stirred up anger. But I also have the commitment to getting things done for my State and our Nation, a commitment to work with anyone, regardless of party, who shares that commitment. PAUL COVERDELL had a powerful faith in bipartisan progress, and I intend to keep that faith.

Let me repeat to this Senate the pledge I made to my Governor and to the people of Georgia when I accepted this mission. I will serve no single political party but, rather, 7.5 million Georgians, and every day I serve I will do my best to do so in the same spirit of dignity, integrity, and bipartisan cooperation that were the hallmarks of PAUL COVERDELL's career.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed is agreed to.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED

##### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

##### CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 688, H.R. 4733, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001:

Trent Lott, Pete Domenici, Frank Murkowski, Pat Roberts, Jesse Helms, Larry Craig, Ted Stevens, Kit Bond, George Voinovich, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Chuck Grassley, Sam Brownback, Don Nickles, Mike Crapo, Slade Gorton and Orrin Hatch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 4733, an act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Abraham	Feinstein	McCain
Akaka	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Miller
Baucus	Graham	Moynihan
Bayh	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Murray
Biden	Grassley	Nickles
Bingaman	Gregg	Reed
Bond	Hagel	Reid
Boxer	Harkin	Robb
Breaux	Hatch	Roberts
Brownback	Helms	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hollings	Roth
Bunning	Hutchinson	Santorum
Burns	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Byrd	Inhofe	Schumer
Campbell	Inouye	Sessions
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Shelby
Cleland	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerrey	Snowe
Conrad	Kerry	Specter
Craig	Kohl	Stevens
Crapo	Kyl	Thomas
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Dodd	Leahy	Torricelli
Domenici	Levin	Voinovich
Dorgan	Lieberman	Warner
Durbin	Lincoln	Wellstone
Edwards	Lott	Wyden
Enzi	Lugar	
Feingold	Mack	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the conference report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, (H.R. 4576), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of July 17, 2000.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will just take a minute. I want to make a parliamentary inquiry here.

It is my understanding under the agreement there is about an hour and a half that has been set aside to speak on the conference report on the Defense appropriations bill; is that right? Approximately that much time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, there are 60 minutes for Senator MCCAIN from Arizona, 20 minutes for Senator BYRD, 15 minutes for Senator GRAMM of Texas, and 6 minutes equally divided between Senators INOUE and STEVENS, by previous agreement.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent when that time is used, if those Senators have used it, the Senator from Wisconsin be allowed to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time? The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise once again to address the issue of pork-barrel spending in an appropriations bill, in this case the defense appropriations conference report. This bill will pass by an overwhelming margin and with minimal debate. It will occasion the release of innumerable press statements attesting to our individual successes in bringing home the bacon.

As we worship at the altar of pork-barrel spending, let's reflect a bit on the merits of our activities with respect to the practice of adding unrequested programs to the defense budget for parochial reasons. When the defense appropriations bill first emerged from committee, some of us found interesting the inclusion of language urging the Secretary of Defense to "take steps to increase the Department's use of cranberry products. . . ." What I referred to at the time as "the cranberry incident," Mr. President, in retrospect represented the high point of the process by which this conference report was assembled.

There are over \$7 billion in unrequested member-adds in this bill—over \$7 billion. That does not just represent a continuation of business as usual pork-barrel spending; it represents an egregious expansion of a practice that drains vital resources from a military that has witnessed a multitude of readiness problems while deploying at record-high levels. As we struggle with answers to such problems as how to modernize tactical aviation, maintain a fleet of sufficient size and capability to execute its mission, and fund ongoing and unforeseen contingencies, it is less than reassuring to read through the defense spending bill and see \$1.8 million earmarked for development of a handheld holographic radar gun, although Trekkies across the nation will no doubt be pleased by this project.

It is tiresome to scan these bills every year and see the annual member-adds of millions of dollars for spectral hole burning applications and for free electron lasers. And it is particularly tiresome, right after passing an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that included an executive jet for the commandant of the Coast Guard, to see in this bill a \$60 million earmark for a new 737 for CINCPAC—an important command but \$60 million for an aircraft that was neither requested nor required constitutes just one of many questionable additions to this bill.

We have finally reversed 15 years in declines in defense spending, but for what purpose. To transfer \$10 million to the Department of Transportation to realign railroad tracks in Alaska? To transfer \$5 million to the National Park Service for repair improvements at Fort Baker in northern California? To transfer another \$5 million to the Chicago Public Schools to convert a

former National Guard Armory? Was our objective in increasing defense spending to allow us to more freely earmark funding for such endeavors as the \$500,000 for Florida Memorial College for funding minority aviation training; \$21 million for the Civil Air Patrol; to continue to fund a weather reconnaissance squadron in Mississippi that the Air Force has been trying to get rid off for more years than I can remember? There is over \$4 million in this bill for the Angel Gate Academy. There is the now annual allocation to preserve Civil War-era vessels at the bottom of Lake Champlain, this year in the amount of \$15 million. There is \$2 million for the Bosque Redondo Memorial in New Mexico and the usual \$3 million for hyperspectral research.

If a project is so worthy of Defense Department support, why doesn't it ever show up in a budget request? Why do we need to add money every single year for the National Automotive Center and its prize off-shoot, the Smart Truck Initiative. With another \$3.5 million in the fiscal year 2001 defense bill for Smart Truck, I'm beginning to wonder if the intellect of this truck will be such that it will not only be capable of heating up a burrito, but will also perform advanced calculus while quoting Kierkegaard. When I look through this bill, I begin to lose sight of its fundamental purpose. The distinction between the defense bill and the Health and Human Services bill gets lost when you see \$8.5 million for the Gallo Center for Alcoholism Research, \$4 million for the Gallo Cancer Center—see a pattern emerging?—another \$1.5 million for nutrition research, \$1.5 million for chronic fatigue syndrome research, and, of course, \$1 million for the Cancer Center of Excellence—this latter add a reminder that if you call something a "center of excellence" you are assured of being a beneficiary of Congress's largess.

Mr. President, I do not take issue with research into important health problems affecting millions of Americans. But the abuse of the defense budget grows every year. It has long been used as a cash-cow for pet projects, but did that have to extend to the allocation of millions of dollars for programs of such exceedingly low priority that they don't even show up on already politicized unfunded priority lists?

Astronomical Active Optics, Mr. President, were deemed worthy of over \$3 million in defense funds, as was coal based advanced thermally stable jet fuel. Fifteen million dollars for the Maui Space Surveillance System, another annual add, \$5 million for the Hawaii Federal Health Care Network, \$8 million for the Pacific Island Health Care Referral Program, \$1 million for the Alaska Federal Health Care Network, \$1.5 million for AlaskaAlert, \$7 million for MILES 2000 equipment at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, \$7.5 million for a C-130 simulator for the Alaska National Guard, the annual \$10 million